REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-17 and 21-28 have been rejected.

Claims 18-20 have been objected to.

Reconsideration of Claims 1-28 is respectfully requested.

I.   ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 18-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, at this time, the Applicants have not elected to rewrite these claims in light of the arguments and comments set forth below.

II.   REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 7, 10 and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 7,366,145 issued to Hannu Flinck ("Flinck").

Claims 13, 16 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 7,475,241 issued to Alpesh Patel et al. ("Patel").

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

A cited prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. MPEP § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single cited prior art reference. MPEP § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

The Office Action asserts that "Regarding claims 1, and 21-24, Flinck discloses a fast recovery from unusable home server comprising: receiving registration information (see abstract, figure mobile node MN, home agent HA, col.3, lines 10-20); executing a self-selection method on an apparatus in response to receiving the registration information, the self-selection method enabling the apparatus to select itself as a home agent (see abstract, figure mobile node MN, home agent HA, col.3, lines 21-30); and responding to the registration information in response to performing the self-selecting (see abstract, figure mobile node MN, home agent HA, col.3, lines 21-37). (May 8, 2009 Office Action, Page 2, Line 22 to Page 3, Line 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees, and directs the Examiner's attention to the elements of Claim 1.

1.   (Previously Presented) A method of registering a mobile node comprising:
        receiving registration information;
        executing a self-selection method on an apparatus in response to receiving the registration information, <u>the self-selection method enabling the apparatus to select itself as a home agent</u>; and
        responding to the registration information in response to performing the self-selecting. (Emphasis added).

Flinck does not execute a self-selection method that enables an apparatus to select itself as a home agent. The mobile node MN selects a first home agent HA for registration from a list of a plurality of home agents that are maintained in the mobile node MN. (Flinck, Column 3, Lines 21-23). The mobile node MN then sends a binding update message to the first home agent HA. (Flinck, Column 3, Lines 23-24). If the first home agent HA can not support the mobile node MN, then the first home agent HA selects a second home agent HA to support the mobile node MN. (Flinck, Column 3, Lines 38-44). The first home agent HA then sends a binding acknowledgment message to the mobile node with the address of the second home agent HA. (Flinck, Column 3, Lines 44-47). The mobile node then performs registration with the second home agent HA. (Flinck, Column 3, Lines 48-51).

It is clear that Flinck does not execute a self-selection method that enables an apparatus to select _itself_ as a home agent. The first home agent HA in the Flinck method does _not_ select itself as a home agent. The first home agent HA in the Flinck method selects a second (different) home agent HA to support the mobile node MN.

Therefore, the Applicants' method as set forth in Claim 1 (as well as in dependent Claims 7 and 10) is not anticipated by the Flinck reference. Similarly, the Applicants' apparatus as set forth in Claims 21-24 is also not anticipated by the Flinck reference.

The Office Action also asserts that "Regarding claims 13, 16, and 25-28, Patel discloses methods and apparatus for dynamic key generation and rekeying in mobile IP, comprising receiving registration information at a home agent (see figs.1-3, step 304); generating a value that falls within a range of numbers in response to receiving the registration information (see figs.1-3, step 306-312); comparing the value to a predefined range of numbers in response to generating the value (see figs.1-3, step 314); and if the value falls within the predefined range of numbers, responding to the registration information (see figs. 1-3, step 316). (May 8, 2009 Office Action, Page 3, Lines 10-16). Again, the Applicants respectfully disagree, and direct the Examiner's attention to the elements of Claim 13.

> 13. (Previously Presented) A method of registering a mobile node comprising:
> receiving registration information at a home agent;
> generating a value that falls within a range of numbers in response to receiving the registration information;
> comparing the value to a predefined range of numbers in response to generating the value; and
> if the value falls within the predefined range of numbers, responding to the registration information. (Emphasis added).

The Patel reference discloses a method for authenticating a mobile node to a home agent in a wireless communication system. The method of authentication is described with reference to Figure 3 of the Patel reference. (Patel, Figure 3, Column 3, Lines 22-48). The authentication process described in the Patel reference is not the same as a registration process for a mobile node. That is,

the authentication process described in the Patel reference must be performed to authenticate the mobile node before the method of registering the mobile node can go forward. Moreover, Patel describes a step of receiving "authentication information at a home agent" and does not disclose a step of receiving "registration information at a home agent." The method that is described with reference to Figure 3 of Patel performs an authentication function.

Furthermore, in the Patel method the mobile node generates a mobile node authenticator using a specified algorithm. (Patel, Figure 3, Step 306, Column 3, Lines 26-28). The mobile node then sends a registration request (with the mobile node authenticator) to the home agent. (Patel, Figure 3, Step 308, Column 3, Lines 28-31). The home agent then generates a home agent authenticator (Patel, Figure 3, Step 312, Column 3, Lines 34-37) and compares the mobile node authenticator with the home agent authenticator. (Patel, Figure 3, Step 314, Column 3, Lines 37-39). If the mobile node authenticator and the home agent authenticator match, then the mobile node is authenticated. (Patel, Figure 3, Step 316, Column 3, Lines 39-42).

The Patel reference does not disclose the concept of generating a value that falls within a range of numbers in response to receiving the registration information. The home agent does not receive the registration information until after the authentication process has been completed. The authenticator value that is generated by the home agent does not fall within a range of numbers. That is, there is no range of numbers specified for the authentication value that is generated by the home agent.

Furthermore, the home agent does not compare the home agent authenticator value to a predefined range of numbers. The home agent authenticator value must exactly match the mobile node authenticator value in order for the mobile node to be authenticated. There is nothing in the Patel reference that states that the home agent authenticator value is to be compared to a predefined range of numbers. Lastly, there is nothing in the Patel reference that states that the home agent responds to registration information from the mobile node if the value of the home agent authenticator value falls within a predefined range of numbers.

Therefore, independent Claim 13 is not anticipated by the Patel reference.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 16 and 25-28, the Applicants respectfully point out that the Patel reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the concept of identifying mobile node registration information as a <u>retransmission</u> of a registration request. Therefore, the Patel reference does not anticipate Claims 16 and 25-28.

In view of the Applicants' arguments and comments concerning the Flinck reference, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the § 102(e) rejections of Claims 1, 7, 10 and 21-24. In view of the Applicants' arguments and comments concerning the Patel reference, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the § 102(e) rejections of Claims 13, 16 and 25-28.

III.   REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flinck in view of Patel. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

For the same or similar reasons set forth above with respect to the anticipation rejection of the independent claims, the Flinck reference and the Patel reference fail to disclose one or more elements. No other reference is cited as disclosing such features/elements. Therefore, the Flinck reference and the Patel reference fail to disclose, teach or suggest all the elements of dependent Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15 and 17.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the § 103(a) obviousness rejections of Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15 and 17.

IV.   CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicants assert that the remaining Claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request an early allowance of such Claims.

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *rmccutcheon@munckcarter.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Nortel Networks Deposit Account No. 14-1315.

Respectfully submitted,

MUNCK CARTER, LLP

Date: _8/10/2009_

Robert D. McCutcheon
Registration No. 38,717

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 628-3632 (direct dial)
(972) 628-3600 (main number)
(972) 628-3616 (fax)
E-mail: *rmccutcheon@munckcarter.com*